REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Response to Claims 69-79

==========

As previously amended, independent claim 69 is recited below:

69. A semiconductor chip or wafer comprising:
a semiconductor substrate having multiple semiconductor devices;
an interconnecting metallization structure over said semiconductor substrate;
a passivation layer over said interconnecting metallization structure, wherein an opening in said passivation layer exposes a contact point of said interconnecting metallization structure;
a first metal layer over said contact point, wherein said first metal layer comprises aluminum; and
a second metal layer over said first metal layer, wherein said second metal layer is used to be wirebonded thereto.

==========

Reconsideration of Claims 69, 70 and 72-74 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yanagida (US6,545,355).

Applicants respectfully assert that the method claimed in claim 69 patentably distinguishes over the citation by Yanagida (US6,545,355).

Yanagida teaches that an electronic component comprising a passivation layer 14 over an interconnecting metallization structure 12, wherein an opening in the passivation layer 14 exposes a contact point 12a of the interconnecting metallization structure 12. The electronic component further comprises a first metal layer 20a over the contact point 12a, wherein the first metal layer 20a comprises aluminum. The electronic component further comprises a second metal layer 24 over the first metal layer 20a. ~ *See FIG. 1, and lines 4-20, col. 6* ~

Yanagida teaches that the second metal layer 24 is used to have a solder ball 26 formed thereon. ~ *See FIG. 1, and lines 21-22, col. 6* ~ However, Yanagida et al. fail to teach, hint or suggest the second metal layer 24 may be used to be wirebonded thereto.

Examiner considers that "although Yanagida fails to specifically disclose "wire bonding capability", the same material is utilized in Yanagida as in Applicant's invention therefore it would have the same characteristics". However, applicants do not consider that one skilled in the art should be motivated to replace the solder-ball technology with the wire-bonding technology. The mechanism of bonding a wire to a pad by a wirebonding process is significantly different from that of bonding a solder ball to a pad. Examiner should search for the technology field of "bonding a wire to a pad by a wirebonding process" to build the prima-facie cases, but not search for the technology field of "bonding a solder ball to a pad" to build the prima-facie cases.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit independent claim 69 patently distinguishes over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 70-79 patently define over the prior art as well.

CONCLUSION

Some or all of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims and the application as a whole are respectfully requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Owens not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned at 845 452-3204 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761